arXiv:1402.6422v1 [cs.IT] 26 Feb 2014

A Novel User Pairing Scheme for Functional Decode-and-Forward Multi-way Relay Network

Shama N. Islam, Salman Durrani and Parastoo Sadeghi

Research School of Engineering

College of Engineering and Computer Science

The Australian National University, Canberra, Australia

E-mail: {shama.islam, salman.durrani, parastoo.sadeghi}@anu.edu.au

Abstract

In this paper, we consider a functional decode and forward (FDF) multi-way relay network (MWRN) where a common user facilitates each user in the network to obtain messages from all other users. We propose a novel user pairing scheme, which is based on the principle of selecting a common user with the best average channel gain. This allows the user with the best channel conditions to contribute to the overall system performance. Assuming lattice code based transmissions, we derive upper bounds on the average common rate capacity and the average sum rate with the proposed pairing scheme. Considering binary phase shift keying modulation as the simplest case of lattice code transmission, we derive asymptotic average bit error rate (BER) of the MWRN. We show that in terms of the achievable rates, the proposed pairing scheme outperforms the existing pairing schemes under a wide range of channel scenarios. The proposed pairing scheme also has lower average BER compared to existing schemes. We show that overall, the MWRN performance with the proposed pairing scheme is more robust, compared to existing pairing schemes, especially under worst case channel conditions when majority of users have poor average channel gains.

Index Terms

Multi-way relay network, functional decode and forward, pairing scheme, wireless network coding.

I. INTRODUCTION

Multi-way relay networks (MWRNs), where a single relay facilitates all users in the network to exchange information with every other user, have important potential applications in teleconferencing, data exchange in a sensor network or file sharing in a social network [1]–[10]. A MWRN is a generalization of two-way relay networks (TWRNs), which enable bidirectional information exchange between two users and are widely recognized in the literature for their improved spectral efficiency, compared to conventional relaying [11]–[15]. Note that multi-user TWRNs [16]–[21], where each user exchanges information with a pre-assigned user only, can be considered as a special case of MWRNs.

The users in a MWRN can adopt either pairwise transmission [1], [5], [9] or non-pairwise transmission [4], [6], [8], [22] strategy for message exchange. Though non-pairwise transmission can offer larger spectral efficiency, its benefits come at the expense of additional signal processing complexity at the relay [6]. Hence, in this paper, we focus on pairwise transmission strategy. Recently, pairwise transmission based MWRNs have been studied for different relaying protocols, e.g., functional decode and forward (FDF) [1], decode and forward [4], amplify and forward [5] and compute and forward [7] protocols. It was shown in [1] that pairwise FDF with binary linear codes for MWRN, where the relay decodes a function of the users' messages rather than the individual messages from a user pair, is theoretically the optimal strategy since it achieves the common-rate capacity. Also it was shown in [2] that for a MWRN with lattice codes in an Additive White Gaussian Noise (AWGN) channel, the pairwise FDF achieves the common rate capacity. Hence, in this paper, we consider FDF MWRN.

In a pairwise transmission based FDF MWRN, user pair formation is a critical issue. In this regard, two different pairing schemes have been proposed in the literature. In the pairing scheme in [1], the ℓ^{th} and the $(\ell+1)^{th}$ users form a pair at the ℓ^{th} time slot, where $\ell \in [1, L-1]$) and L is the number of users in the MWRN. In the pairing scheme in [9], instead of consecutive users as in the pairing scheme in [1], the ℓ^{th} and the $(L-\ell+1)^{th}$ user form a pair at the ℓ^{th} time slot when $1 \leq \ell \leq \lfloor L/2 \rfloor$ and the $(\ell+1)^{th}$ and $(L-\ell+1)^{th}$ user form a pair at the ℓ^{th} time slot when $\lfloor L/2 \rfloor < \ell \leq L-1$, where $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denotes the floor operation. The achievable rates for these two existing pairing schemes were analyzed in [1], [2], [9], while the average bit error rate (BER) for the first pairing scheme was analyzed in [23]. A major drawback of the above two pairing schemes is that they do not take the users' channel information into account when pairing the users. This is crucial since in a MWRN, the decision about each user depends on the decisions about all other users transmitting before it. Thus, in the above pairing schemes, if any

user experiences poor channel conditions, it can lead to incorrect detection of another user's message, which can adversely impact the system performance due to error propagation.

In this paper, we propose a novel pairing scheme for user pair formation in a FDF MWRN. In this scheme, each user is paired with a common user, which is chosen by the relay as the user with the best average channel gain. This allows the user with the best channel conditions to contribute to improving the overall system performance by reducing the error propagation in the network. The major contributions of this paper are as follows:

- Considering an L-user FDF MWRN with general lattice code based transmission, we derive upper bounds for the common rate capacity and sum rate with the proposed pairing scheme (cf. Theorems $1-2$).
- Considering an L-user FDF MWRN with Binary Phase Shift Keying (BPSK) modulation based transmission, which is the simplest case of lattice code based transmission, we derive the asymptotic average BER with the proposed pairing scheme (cf. Theorem 3).
- Comparing the performance of the proposed pairing scheme with the existing pairing schemes, we show that:
  - For the equal average channel gain scenario, the average common rate capacity and the average sum rate are the same for the proposed and existing pairing schemes, but the average BER improves with the proposed pairing scheme (cf. Propositions 1, 4 and 7).
  - For the unequal average channel gain scenario, the average common rate capacity, the average sum rate and the average BER all improve with the proposed pairing scheme (cf. Propositions 2, 5 and 8).
  - For the variable average channel gain scenario, the average common rate capacity with the proposed pairing scheme is practically the same as the existing pairing schemes, whereas, the average sum rate and the average BER improve with the proposed pairing scheme (cf. Propositions 3, 6 and 9).

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. The system model is presented in Section II. The proposed pairing scheme is discussed in Section III and the general lattice code based transmissions with the proposed pairing scheme are presented in Section IV. The common rate capacity and the sum rate for a FDF MWRN with the proposed scheme is derived in Section V. The average BER is derived in Section VI. The numerical and simulation results for verification of the analytical solutions are provided



Fig. 1. System model for an L-user multi-way relay network (MWRN), where the users exchange information with each other via the relay R. Here, 'TS' means time slot and user 1 is considered to be the common user (for illustration purpose).

in Section VII. Finally, conclusions are provided in Section VIII.

Throughout this paper, we use the following notations: $\bigoplus$ denotes element wise XOR operation, $\hat{(\cdot)}$ denotes the estimate of a message, $\hat{\hat{(\cdot)}}$ denotes that the message is estimated for the second time, $|\cdot|$ denotes absolute value of a complex variable, $\arg(\cdot)$ denotes the argument, $\max(\cdot)$ denotes the maximum value, $\min(\cdot)$ denotes the minimum value, $E[\cdot]$ denotes the expected value of a random variable, $\lfloor\cdot\rfloor$ denotes the floor operation, $\log(\cdot)$ denotes logarithm to the base two and $Q(\cdot)$ is the Gaussian Q-function.

II. System Model

We consider an L-user MWRN, where all the users exchange their information with each other through a single relay, as illustrated in Fig. 1. In this setup, a pair of users communicate with each other at a time, while, the remaining users are silent. We assume that the users transmit in a half-duplex manner and they do not have any direct link in between them. The information exchange takes place in two phases−multiple access and broadcast phase−each comprising $L-1$ time slots for an L-user MWRN [1]. In the *multiple access phase*, the users transmit their data in a pairwise manner. In the *broadcast phase*, the relay broadcasts the decoded network coded message to all users. After $2(L-1)$ time slots, all users have the network coded messages corresponding to each user pair and then they utilize self information to extract the messages of all the other users. We refer to these $2(L-1)$ time slots in the two phases as one *time frame*. That is, in each time frame, each user transmits a message packet of length T and the relay transmits $(L-1)$ message packets, each of length T. Thus, a total of $(2L-1)$ message packets are communicated in an entire time frame. We choose the index for time slot and time frame as t_s and t_f, respectively, and the message index as t where, $t_s \in [1, L-1]$, $t \in [1, T]$ and $t_f \in [1, F]$, where, F is the

total number of time frames. The transmission power of each user is P, whereas, the transmission power of the relay is P_r. At the t_f^{th} time frame and the t_s^{th} time slot, the channel from the j^{th} user to the relay is denoted by $h_{j,r}^{t_s,t_f}$ and the channel from the relay to the j^{th} user by $h_{r,j}^{t_s,t_f}$, where $j \in [1, L]$. We make the following assumptions regarding the channels:

- The channels are assumed to be block Rayleigh fading channels, which remain constant during one message packet transmission in a certain time slot in a certain multiple access or broadcast phase. The channels in different time slots (e.g., $h_{1,r}^{1,1}$ and $h_{1,r}^{2,1}$) and different time frames (e.g., $h_{1,r}^{1,1}$ and $h_{1,r}^{1,2}$) are considered to be independent. Also, the channels from users to the relay (e.g., $h_{j,r}^{t_s,t_f}$) and the channels from the relay to users (e.g., $h_{r,j}^{t_s,t_f}$) are reciprocal.
- The fading channel coefficients are zero mean complex-valued Gaussian random variables with variances $\sigma_{h_{j,r}}^2 = \sigma_{h_{r,j}}^2$.
- The perfect instantaneous channel state information (CSI) of all users is available to the relay. The users have access to the self CSI only, which has been assumed in many research works [24]–[26].

We consider the following three different channel scenarios in this work:

1) *Equal average channel gain scenario:* All the channels from the relay to the users and the users to the relay have equal average channel gain, which remain fixed for all time frames. That is, $E[|\ h_{1,r}^{t_s,t_f}\ |^2] = E[|\ h_{2,r}^{t_s,t_f}\ |^2] = ... = E[|\ h_{L,r}^{t_s,t_f}\ |^2]$.
2) *Unequal average channel gain scenario:* All the channels from the relay to the users and the users to the relay have unequal average channel gains which remain fixed for all the time frames. That is, $E[|\ h_{1,r}^{t_s,t_f}\ |^2] \neq E[|\ h_{2,r}^{t_s,t_f}\ |^2] \neq ... \neq E[|\ h_{L,r}^{t_s,t_f}\ |^2]$ and $E[|\ h_{j,r}^{t_s,1}\ |^2] = E[|\ h_{j,r}^{t_s,2}\ |^2] = ... = E[|\ h_{j,r}^{t_s,F}\ |^2]$.
3) *Variable average channel gain scenario:* All the channels from the relay to the users and the users to the relay have unequal average channel gains and the channel conditions change after a block of T_f' ($T_f' < F$) time frames. That is, $E[|\ h_{1,r}^{t_s,t_f}\ |^2] \neq E[|\ h_{2,r}^{t_s,t_f}\ |^2] \neq ... \neq E[|\ h_{L,r}^{t_s,t_f}\ |^2]$ and $E[|\ h_{j,r}^{t_s,aT_f'+1}\ |^2] = E[|\ h_{j,r}^{t_s,aT_f'+2}\ |^2] = ... = E[|\ h_{j,r}^{t_s,(a+1)T_f'}\ |^2]$ for $j \in [1, L]$ and $0 \leq a \leq \frac{F}{T_f'} - 1$, where T_f' is the number of time frames after which the unequal average channel gains change.

The above scenarios can model a wide variety of practical channel scenarios. For example, the equal average channel gain scenario is applicable to satellite communications, where the users are equidistant from the relay. The unequal average channel gain scenario is applicable to fixed users (e.g., located at home or workplace) in a network, where the users' distances from the relay are unequal but remain fixed. The variable average channel gain scenario is applicable to mobile users in a network, where the users'

distances from the relay are unequal and vary due to user mobility.

III. Proposed Pairing Scheme for MWRN

In this section, we propose a new pairing scheme for user pair formation in the multiple access phase (illustrated in Fig. 1) which is defined by the following set of principles:

- P1 The common user is selected by the relay to be the user that has the best average channel gain in the system.
- P2 The common user's index is broadcast by the relay prior to each multiple access phase. This common user transmits in all the time slots in the multiple access phase and the other users take turns to form a pair with this common user.
- P3 The common user is kept fixed for all the time slots within a certain time frame. After some time frames, the common user might change depending upon the changing channel conditions.

The proposed pairing scheme allows the best channel in the system to contribute towards the error-free detection of each user's message, which would not be possible if the common user is chosen without considering the channel conditions, as in [1], [9].

Since the common user is involved in all the transmissions in the multiple access phase, an issue of transmission fairness arises in the context of the proposed scheme, i.e., on average each user should transmit the same number of times (equivalently consume the same amount of power overall). We propose to achieve transmission fairness for the three channel scenarios, considered in this work, in the following manner

1) *Equal average channel gain scenario:* In this scenario, any of the users can be selected as the common user, since all the average channel gains are the same. To maintain transmission fairness among the users, we randomly select a different common user in each time frame so that, on average, every user gets the opportunity to become the common user.
2) *Unequal average channel gain scenario:* In this scenario, only the user with the best average channel gain can become the common user. Thus, the common user's transmission power must be scaled by $(L-1)$, since it transmits $(L-1)$ times, whereas, other users transmit only once.
3) *Variable average channel gain scenario:* In this scenario, the channel conditions change after a block of T_f' time frames. During each time frame, the user with the best average channel gain is chosen as the common user and this process is repeated for every time frame so that, on average, every user gets the opportunity to become the common user.

IV. Signal Transmissions With the Proposed Pairing Scheme

In this section, we discuss the general lattice code based transmissions with the proposed pairing scheme in a MWRN. We denote the i^{th} user as the common user and the ℓ^{th} user as the other users, where, $i, \ell \in [1, L]$ and $\ell \neq i$. For the rest of this paper, we consider message exchange within a certain time frame and choose to omit the superscript t_f from the symbols for simplifying the notations.

A. Preliminaries on Lattice Codes

As our proposed pairing scheme is based on lattice codes, we first present the definitions of some primary operations on lattice codes, which we have used in the later subsections. Our notations for lattice codes follow those of [2], [8]. Further details on lattice codes are available in [22], [27]–[29].

An N-dimensional lattice is a discrete subgroup of the N-dimensional complex field $\mathbb{C}^N$ under the normal vector addition operation and can be expressed as [8], [29]:

$$\Lambda = \{\lambda = \mathbf{G}_\Lambda c : c \in \mathbb{Z}^N\} \tag{1}$$

where, $\mathbf{G}_\Lambda \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ is the generator matrix corresponding to the lattice Λ and $\mathbb{Z}$ is the set of integers.

- The nearest neighbour lattice quantizer maps a point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^N$ to a nearest lattice point $\lambda \in \Lambda$ in Euclidean distance [8]. That is,
$$Q_\Lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \arg\min_{\lambda} \mid \mathbf{x} - \lambda \mid^2 \tag{2}$$
- The modulo-Λ operation is defined by $\mathbf{x} \mod \Lambda = \mathbf{x} - Q_\Lambda(\mathbf{x})$ [2], [27]–[29].
- The Voronoi region $\mathcal{V}(\Lambda)$ denotes the set of all points in the N-dimensional complex field $\mathbb{C}^N$, which are closest to the zero vector [8], i.e.,
$$\mathcal{V}(\Lambda) = \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^N : Q_\Lambda(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{0}\}, \tag{3}$$
- $\psi(\cdot)$ denotes the mapping of messages from a finite dimensional field to lattice points, i.e., $\psi(\mathbf{w}) \in \Lambda$, where $\mathbf{w}$ is a message from a finite dimensional field.
- A coarse lattice Λ is nested in a fine lattice Λ_f, i.e., $\Lambda \subseteq \Lambda_f$, so that the messages mapped into fine lattice points remain in the voronoi region of the coarse lattice.
- The dither vectors $\mathbf{d}$ are generated independently from a uniform distribution over the fundamental Voronoi region $\mathcal{V}(\Lambda)$.

B. Multiple Access Phase

In this phase, the common user and one other user transmit simultaneously using FDF based on lattice codes and the relay receives the sum of the signals, i.e., at the $(\ell-1)^{th}$ time slot, users i and ℓ transmit simultaneously.

1) Communication Protocol at the Users: In a certain time frame, the message packet of the ℓ^{th} user is denoted by

$$\mathbf{W}_{\ell}^{t_s} = \begin{cases} \{W_{\ell}^{t_s,1}, W_{\ell}^{t_s,2}, ..., W_{\ell}^{t_s,T}\} & t_s = \ell - 1 \\ 0 & t_s \neq \ell - 1, \end{cases} \tag{4}$$

where, the elements $W_{\ell}^{t_s,t}$ are generated independently and uniformly over a finite field. Similarly, the message packet of the i^{th} user is given by $\mathbf{W}_i = \{W_i^{t_s,1}, W_i^{t_s,2}, ..., W_i^{t_s,T}\}$ for $t_s \in [1, L-1]$.

During a certain time frame, in the $t_s = (\ell-1)^{th}$ time slot, the i^{th} user and the ℓ^{th} user transmit their messages using lattice codes $\mathbf{X}_i = \{X_i^{t_s,1}, X_i^{t_s,2}, ..., X_i^{t_s,T}\}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{\ell}^{t_s} = \{X_{\ell}^{t_s,1}, X_{\ell}^{t_s,2}, ..., X_{\ell}^{t_s,T}\}$, respectively, which can be given by [2], [4]:

$$X_i^{t_s,t} = (\psi(W_i^{t_s,t}) + d_i) \mod \Lambda, \tag{5a}$$

$$X_{\ell}^{t_s,t} = (\psi(W_{\ell}^{t_s,t}) + d_{\ell}) \mod \Lambda, \tag{5b}$$

where, d_i and d_{ℓ} are the dither vectors for the i^{th} and the ℓ^{th} user. The dither vectors are generated at the users and transmitted to the relay prior to message transmission in the multiple access phase [8].

2) Communication Protocol at the Relay: The relay receives the signal $\mathbf{R}_{i,\ell}^{t_s} = \{r_{i,\ell}^{t_s,1}, r_{i,\ell}^{t_s,2}, ..., r_{i,\ell}^{t_s,T}\}$, where

$$r_{i,\ell}^{t_s,t} = \sqrt{P} h_{i,r}^{t_s} X_i^{t_s,t} + \sqrt{P} h_{\ell,r}^{t_s} X_{\ell}^{t_s,t} + n_1, \tag{6}$$

where n_1 is the zero mean complex AWGN at the relay with noise variance $\sigma_{n_1}^2 = \frac{N_0}{2}$ per dimension and N_0 is the noise power.

C. Broadcast Phase

In this phase, the relay broadcasts the decoded network coded message and each user receives it.

1) Communication Protocol at the Relay: The relay scales the received signal with a scalar coefficient α [22] and removes the dithers d_i, d_{ℓ} scaled by $\sqrt{P} h_{i,r}^{t_s}$ and $\sqrt{P} h_{\ell,r}^{t_s}$, respectively. The resulting signal is

given by

$$\begin{aligned} X_r^{t_s,t} &= [\alpha r_{i,\ell}^{t_s,t} - \sqrt{P}h_{i,r}^{t_s}d_i - \sqrt{P}h_{\ell,r}^{t_s}d_\ell] \mod \Lambda \\ &= [\sqrt{P}h_{i,r}^{t_s}X_i^{t_s,t} + \sqrt{P}h_{\ell,r}^{t_s}X_\ell^{t_s,t} + (\alpha-1)\sqrt{P}(h_{i,r}^{t_s}X_i^{t_s,t} + h_{\ell,r}^{t_s}X_\ell^{ts,t}) + \alpha n_1 - \sqrt{P}h_{i,r}^{t_s}d_i - \sqrt{P}h_{\ell,r}^{t_s}d_\ell] \mod \Lambda \\ &= [\sqrt{P}h_{i,r}^{t_s}\psi(W_i^t) + \sqrt{P}h_{\ell,r}^{t_s}\psi(W_\ell^{t_s,t}) + n] \mod \Lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where, $n = (\alpha-1)\sqrt{P}(h_{i,r}^{t_s}X_i^t + h_{\ell,r}^{t_s}X_\ell^{ts,t}) + \alpha n_1$ and α is chosen to minimize the noise variance [27], [28].

The relay decodes the signal in (7) with a lattice quantizer [22], [27] to obtain an estimate $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{i,\ell}^{t_s} = \{\hat{V}_{i,\ell}^{t_s,1}, \hat{V}_{i,\ell}^{t_s,2}, ..., \hat{V}_{i,\ell}^{t_s,T}\}$ which is a function of the messages $\mathbf{W}_i$ and $\mathbf{W}_\ell^{t_s}$. Since, for sufficiently large N, Pr$(n \notin \mathcal{V})$ approaches zero [22], $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{i,\ell}^{t_s} = (\psi(\mathbf{W}_i) + \psi(\mathbf{W}_\ell^{t_s})) \mod \Lambda$. The relay then adds a dither d_r with the network coded message which is generated at the relay and broadcast to the users prior to message transmission in the broadcast phase [8]. Then it broadcasts the resulting message using lattice codes, which is given as $\mathbf{Z}_{i,\ell}^{t_s} = \{Z_{i,\ell}^{t_s,1}, Z_{i,\ell}^{t_s,2}, ..., Z_{i,\ell}^{t_s,T}\}$, where $Z_{i,\ell}^{t_s,t} = (\hat{V}_{i,\ell}^{t_s,t} + d_r) \mod \Lambda$.

2) Communication Protocol at the Users: The j^{th} user receives $\mathbf{Y}_{i,\ell}^{t_s} = \{Y_{i,\ell}^{t_s,1}, Y_{i,\ell}^{t_s,2}, ..., Y_{i,\ell}^{t_s,T}\}$, where

$$Y_{i,\ell}^{t_s,t} = \sqrt{P_r}h_{r,j}^{t_s}Z_{i,\ell}^{t_s,t} + n_2, \tag{8}$$

and n_2 is the zero mean complex AWGN at the user with noise variance $\sigma_{n_2}^2 = \frac{N_0}{2}$ per dimension. At the end of the broadcast phase, the j^{th} user scales the received signal with a scalar coefficient β_j and removes the dithers d_r multiplied by $\sqrt{P_r}h_{r,j}$. The resulting signal is

$$\begin{aligned} [\beta_j Y_{i,\ell}^{t_s,t} - \sqrt{P_r}h_{r,j}^{t_s}d_r] \mod \Lambda &= [\sqrt{P_r}h_{r,j}^{t_s}\hat{V}_{i,\ell}^{t_s,t} + (\beta_j - 1)\sqrt{P_r}h_{r,j}^{t_s}\hat{V}_{i,\ell}^{t_s,t} + \beta_j n_2] \mod \Lambda \\ &= [\sqrt{P_r}h_{r,j}^{t_s}\hat{V}_{i,\ell}^{t_s,t} + n'] \mod \Lambda, \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

where, $n' = \sqrt{P_r}h_{r,j}^{t_s}(\beta_j - 1)\hat{V}_{i,\ell}^{t_s,t} + \beta_j n_2$ and β_j is chosen to minimize the noise variance [8]. The users then detect the received signal with a lattice quantizer [8] and obtain the estimate $\hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,\ell}^{t_s} = (\psi(\mathbf{W}_i) + \psi(\mathbf{W}_\ell^{t_s})) \mod \Lambda$, assuming that the lattice dimension is large enough such that Pr$(n' \notin \mathcal{V})$ approaches zero. After decoding all the network coded messages, each user performs message extraction of every other user by canceling self information.

3) Message Extraction at the Common User: For the common user (i^{th} user), this message extraction involves simply subtracting the lattice point corresponding to its own message from the lattice network

coded messages $\hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,\ell}^{t_s}$. The process can be shown as

$$\psi(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_{\ell}^{t_s}) = (\hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,\ell}^{t_s} - \psi(\mathbf{W}_i)) \mod \Lambda, \quad \ell \in [1, L], \ell \neq i. \tag{10}$$

4) Message Extraction at the Other Users: For other users, the process is different from the common user. At first, the ℓ^{th} user subtracts the scaled lattice point corresponding to its own message, i.e., $\psi(\mathbf{W}_{\ell}^{t_s})$ from the network coded message received in the $(\ell-1)^{th}$ time slot (i.e., $\hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,\ell}^{t_s}$) and extracts the message of the i^{th} user as $\psi(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_i)$. After that, it utilizes the extracted message of the i^{th} user to obtain the messages of other users in a similar manner. The message extraction process in this case can be shown as

$$\psi(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_i) = (\hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,\ell}^{t_s} - \psi(\mathbf{W}_{\ell}^{t_s})) \mod \Lambda, \tag{11a}$$

$$\psi(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_m^{t_s}) = (\hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,m}^{t_s} - \psi(\hat{\mathbf{W}}_i)) \mod \Lambda, \quad m \in [1, L], m \neq i, \ell. \tag{11b}$$

V. Common Rate and Sum Rate Analysis

In this section, we investigate common rate capacity and sum rate of the MWRN with the proposed pairing scheme. We first analyze the SNR of each user pair in a MWRN and use these results to obtain expressions for the achievable rates. For the rest of this paper, we simplify the notations by omitting the time slot superscript t_s.

A. SNR analysis

In a FDF MWRN, the decoding operation is performed after both the multiple access phase and the broadcast phase. Thus, we need to consider the SNR at the users and the SNR at the relay, separately.

1) SNR at the Users: The SNR at the users have the same expressions for all the three pairing schemes. The signal transmission from the relay to any user $j \in [1, L]$ is the same as that in a point-to-point fading channel. Thus, the SNR of the $m^{th}(m \in [1, L])$ user's signal received at the j^{th} user is given by:

$$\gamma_j = \frac{P_r \mid h_{r,j} \mid^2}{\mid \beta_j \mid^2 N_0 + P_r \mid \beta_j - 1 \mid^2 \mid h_{r,j} \mid^2}. \tag{12}$$

where, the numerator represents power of the signal part in (9) and the denominator represents the power of the noise term n' in (9).

2) SNR at the Relay: In a FDF MWRN based on lattice coding with the proposed pairing scheme, the SNR of the received signal at the relay can be obtained from (7) as

$$\gamma_r(i,\ell) = \frac{P \min(\mid h_{i,r} \mid^2, \mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2)}{\mid \alpha \mid^2 N_0 + P \mid \alpha - 1 \mid^2 (\mid h_{i,r} \mid^2 + \mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2)}, \tag{13}$$

where, the numerator represents the power of the signal part (i.e., $\sqrt{P}h_{i,r}^{t_s}\psi(W_i^t) + \sqrt{P}h_{\ell,r}^{t_s}\psi(W_\ell^{t_s,t})$ in (7)) and the denominator represents the power of the noise terms n in (7).

For the pairing scheme in [1], the SNR received at the relay can be expressed as

$$\gamma_r(i) = \frac{P \min(\mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2, \mid h_{\ell+1,r} \mid^2)}{\mid \alpha \mid^2 N_0 + P \mid \alpha - 1 \mid^2 (\mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2 + \mid h_{\ell+1,r} \mid^2)}. \tag{14}$$

Similarly, for the pairing scheme in [9], the SNR at the relay is given by

$$\gamma_r(i) = \frac{P \min(\mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2, \mid h_{L-\ell+2,r} \mid^2)}{\mid \alpha \mid^2 N_0 + P \mid \alpha - 1 \mid^2 (\mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2 + \mid h_{L-\ell+2,r} \mid^2)}. \tag{15}$$

Note that (13), (14) and (15) have the same form and differ in the indices of the channel coefficients, which is determined by the pairing scheme.

B. Common Rate Capacity

Common rate capacity indicates the maximum possible information rate of the system that can be exchanged with negligible error. It can be a useful metric for the systems where all the users have the same amount of information to exchange [2].

Assuming lattice codes with sufficiently large dimensions are employed, the common rate capacity for an L-user FDF MWRN is given by [1], [9]

$$R_c = \frac{1}{L-1} \min_{\ell-1 \in [1, L-1]} \{R_{c,\ell-1}\}, \tag{16}$$

where, the factor $\frac{1}{L-1}$ is due to the fact that the complete message exchange requires $L-1$ time slots and $R_{c,\ell-1}$ is the achievable rate in the $(\ell-1)^{th}$ time slot, given by

$$R_{c,\ell-1} = \min\{R_{M,\ell-1}, R_{B,\ell-1}\}, \tag{17}$$

where, $R_{M,\ell-1}$ and $R_{B,\ell-1}$ are the maximum achievable rates at the $(\ell-1)^{th}$ time slot during the multiple access phase and the broadcast phase, respectively. Next, we derive the upper bounds on the maximum achievable rates in the multiple access and broadcast phases.

$$E[R_c] \leq \frac{1}{2(L-1)} E\left[\log\left(\min\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{|h_{\ell,r}|^2}{|h_{i,r}|^2}}+\frac{P\mid h_{i,r}\mid^2}{N_0}, \frac{1}{1+\frac{|h_{i,r}|^2}{|h_{\ell,r}|^2}}+\frac{P\mid h_{\ell,r}\mid^2}{N_0}\right)\right)\right] \tag{20a}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \log\left(E\left[\min\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{|h_{\ell,r}|^2}{|h_{i,r}|^2}}+\frac{P\mid h_{i,r}\mid^2}{N_0}, \frac{1}{1+\frac{|h_{i,r}|^2}{|h_{\ell,r}|^2}}+\frac{P\mid h_{\ell,r}\mid^2}{N_0}\right)\right]\right) \tag{20b}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \log\left(\min\left(E\left[\frac{1}{1+\frac{|h_{\ell,r}|^2}{|h_{i,r}|^2}}+\frac{P\mid h_{i,r}\mid^2}{N_0}\right], E\left[\frac{1}{1+\frac{|h_{i,r}|^2}{|h_{\ell,r}|^2}}+\frac{P\mid h_{\ell,r}\mid^2}{N_0}\right]\right)\right) \tag{20c}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \log\left(\min\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}}+\frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{N_0}, \frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}}+\frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{N_0}\right)\right), \tag{20d}$$

Theorem 1: For the proposed pairing scheme in a FDF MWRN, the maximum achievable rate during the $(\ell-1)^{th}$ time slot in the multiple access phase is upper bounded by

$$R_{M,\ell-1} \leq \frac{1}{2}\log\left(\min\left(\frac{\mid h_{i,r}\mid^2}{\mid h_{i,r}\mid^2+\mid h_{\ell,r}\mid^2}+\frac{P\mid h_{i,r}\mid^2}{N_0}, \frac{\mid h_{\ell,r}\mid^2}{\mid h_{i,r}\mid^2+\mid h_{\ell,r}\mid^2}+\frac{P\mid h_{\ell,r}\mid^2}{N_0}\right)\right), \tag{18}$$

and the maximum achievable rate during the $(\ell-1)^{th}$ time slot in the broadcast phase is upper bounded by

$$R_{B,\ell-1} \leq \frac{1}{2}\log\left(1+\frac{\min_{j\in[1,L]}\mid h_{j,r}\mid^2 P_r}{N_0}\right). \tag{19}$$

Proof: See Appendix A. ■

Note that the common rate capacity for the pairing scheme in [1] and in [9] can be obtained by replacing the subscript i with $\ell-1$ and $L-\ell+2$, respectively in (18) and using (19), (17) and (16).

Using Theorem 1 and substituting in (17) and (16), the average common rate for the proposed pairing scheme can be given as in (20d), where the inequality in (20b) holds from Jensen's inequality and the inequality (20c) comes from the fact that $E[\min(A_1, A_2)] \leq E[A_1]$ and $E[\min(A_1, A_2)] \leq E[A_2]$, where A_1, A_2 are independent random variables.

Similarly, the average common rate for the pairing scheme in [1] can be expressed as

$$E[R_c] \leq \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \log\left(\min\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}}+\frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}{N_0}, \frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}}+\frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{N_0}\right)\right), \tag{21}$$

and the average common rate for the pairing scheme in [9] can be given as

$$E[R_c] \leq \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \log \left(\min \left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}{N_0}, \frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}{N_0}, \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. \frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}{N_0}, \frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{N_0} \right) \right). \quad (22)$$

While (20d)−(22) do not provide tight upper bounds on the average common rate capacity, they allow an analytical comparison of the proposed and existing pairing schemes. The main results from the analytical comparison are summarized in the Propositions 1−3. Note that in Section VII, the actual expressions of the instantaneous rates are averaged over a large number of channel realizations to corroborate the insights presented in Propositions 1−3.

Proposition 1: The average common rate capacity for the proposed pairing scheme and the pairing schemes in [1] and [9] are the same for the equal average channel gain scenario.

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

Proposition 2: The average common rate capacity for the proposed pairing scheme is larger than that of the pairing schemes in [1] and [9] for the unequal average channel gain scenario.

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

Proposition 3: The average common rate capacity for the proposed pairing scheme is practically the same as that of the pairing schemes in [1] and [9], for the variable average channel gain scenario.

Proof: See Appendix B. ■

C. Sum Rate

The sum rate indicates the maximum throughput of the system. For a FDF MWRN, the sum rate can be defined as the sum of the achievable rates of all users for a complete round of information exchange.

Theorem 2: For the proposed pairing scheme in a FDF MWRN, the sum rate is given by:

$$R_s = \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{L} \left(\log \left(\frac{\mid h_{i,r} \mid^2}{\mid h_{i,r} \mid^2 + \mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2} + \frac{P \mid h_{i,r} \mid^2}{N_0} \right) + \log \left(\frac{\mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2}{\mid h_{i,r} \mid^2 + \mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2} + \frac{P \mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2}{N_0} \right) \right). \quad (23)$$

Proof: see Appendix C. ■

$$E[R_s] = \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{L} \left(E\left[\log\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{|h_{\ell,r}|^2}{|h_{i,r}|^2}} + \frac{P \mid h_{i,r} \mid^2}{N_0}\right)\right] + E\left[\log\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{|h_{i,r}|^2}{|h_{\ell,r}|^2}} + \frac{P \mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2}{N_0}\right)\right]\right) \tag{24a}$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{L} \left(\log\left(E\left[\frac{1}{1+\frac{|h_{\ell,r}|^2}{|h_{i,r}|^2}} + \frac{P \mid h_{i,r} \mid^2}{N_0}\right]\right) + \log\left(E\left[\frac{1}{1+\frac{|h_{i,r}|^2}{|h_{\ell,r}|^2}} + \frac{P \mid h_{\ell,r} \mid^2}{N_0}\right]\right)\right) \tag{24b}$$

$$= \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{L} \left(\log\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{N_0}\right) + \log\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{N_0}\right)\right), \tag{24c}$$

Note that the sum rate for the pairing scheme in [1] and the pairing scheme in [9] can be obtained by replacing the subscript i with $\ell - 1$ and $L - \ell + 2$, respectively in (23).

Using Theorem 2, the average sum rate (averaged over all channel realizations) for the proposed pairing scheme can be given as in (24c), where, the inequality holds from Jensen's inequality.

Similarly, the average sum rate for the pairing scheme in [1] can be written as

$$E[R_s] \leq \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \sum_{\ell=2}^{L} \left(\log\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}{N_0}\right) + \log\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{N_0}\right)\right), \tag{25}$$

and the average sum rate for the pairing scheme in [9] can be written as

$$E[R_s] \leq \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \sum_{\ell=2}^{\lfloor L/2 \rfloor+1} \left(\log\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}{N_0}\right) + \log\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}{N_0}\right)\right)$$
$$+ \sum_{\ell=\lfloor L/2 \rfloor+2}^{L} \left(\log\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}{N_0}\right) + \log\left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}} + \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{N_0}\right)\right). \tag{26}$$

(24c)$-$(26) provide upper bounds on the actual average sum rate and they allow an analytical comparison of the proposed and existing pairing schemes. The main results are summarized in Propositions 4$-$6. Note that similar to the case of common rate capacity, in Section VII, the actual expression for the instantaneous sum rate in (23) is averaged over a large number of channel realizations to validate the insights presented in the Propositions 4$-$6.

Proposition 4: The average sum rate of the proposed pairing scheme and the pairing schemes in [1]

and [9] are the same for the equal average channel gain scenario.

Proof: See Appendix D. ■

Proposition 5: The average sum rate of the proposed pairing scheme is larger than that of the pairing schemes in [1] and [9] for the unequal average channel gain scenario.

Proof: See Appendix D. ■

Proposition 6: The average sum rate of the proposed pairing scheme is larger than that of the pairing schemes in [1] and [9] for the variable average channel gain scenario.

Proof: See Appendix D. ■

VI. Error Performance Analysis

In this section, we characterize the error performance of a FDF MWRN with the new pairing scheme. For a tractable analysis, we provide the analytical derivations for BPSK modulation, which is a low dimensional lattice code.

A. System Model

In the BPSK modulated FDF MWRN system, during a certain time frame, in the $t_s = (\ell - 1)^{th}$ time slot, the i^{th} user and the ℓ^{th} user transmit their messages $\mathbf{W}_i$ and $\mathbf{W}_\ell$ which are BPSK modulated to $\mathbf{X}_i = \{X_i^1, X_i^2, ..., X_i^T\}$ and $\mathbf{X}_\ell = \{X_\ell^1, X_\ell^2, ..., X_\ell^T\}$, respectively, where $X_i^t, X_\ell^t \in \{-1, 1\}$. The relay receives the signal $\mathbf{R}_{i,\ell}$ (see (6)) and decodes it using ML criterion [24], [30] and obtains an estimate $\hat{\mathbf{V}}_{i,\ell}$ of the true network coded symbol $\mathbf{V}_{i,\ell} = \mathbf{W}_i \bigoplus \mathbf{W}_\ell$. The relay then broadcasts the estimated network coded signal after BPSK modulation, which is given as $\mathbf{Z}_{i,\ell}$. The j^{th} ($j \in [1, L]$) user receives $\mathbf{Y}_{i,\ell}$ (see (8)) and detects the received signal through ML criterion [24], [30] to obtain the estimate $\hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,\ell}$. After decoding all the network coded messages, each user performs message extraction. For the common user (i^{th} user), this message extraction involves simply XOR-ing the network coded messages $\hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,\ell}$ with its own message $\mathbf{W}_i$. The process can be shown as

$$\hat{\mathbf{W}}_\ell = \hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,\ell} \oplus \mathbf{W}_i, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_{\ell+1} = \hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,\ell+1} \oplus \mathbf{W}_i, ..., \hat{\mathbf{W}}_L = \hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,L} \oplus \mathbf{W}_i. \tag{27}$$

For other users, the message extraction process can be shown as

$$\hat{\mathbf{W}}_i = \hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,\ell} \oplus \mathbf{W}_\ell, \hat{\mathbf{W}}_{\ell+1} = \hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,\ell+1} \oplus \hat{\mathbf{W}}_i, ..., \hat{\mathbf{W}}_L = \hat{\hat{\mathbf{V}}}_{i,L} \oplus \hat{\mathbf{W}}_i. \tag{28}$$

B. BER Analysis for the Proposed Pairing Scheme

In this subsection, we investigate the error performance of a FDF MWRN with the proposed pairing scheme. Unlike the pairing schemes in [1] and [9], the error performance of all the users is not the same for the proposed pairing scheme. Hence, we need to obtain separate expressions for the error probabilities at the common user (i^{th} user) and other users (ℓ^{th} user).

First, we obtain the probability of incorrectly decoding a network coded message at the common user and the other users.

Lemma 1: For the proposed pairing scheme, the probability that the i^{th} (common) user incorrectly decodes the network coded message involving its own message and the m^{th} user's message is given as

$$\begin{aligned} P_{FDF}(i,m) &= P(\hat{\hat{V}}_{i,m} \neq V_{i,m}) \\ &= Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_r(i,m)}\right)\left(1-Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_i}\right)\right)+\left(1-Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_r(i,m)}\right)\right)Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_i}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

where, $\gamma_r(i,m)$ represents the SNR of the i^{th} and the m^{th} users' signal at the relay for BPSK modulation and can be obtained from the minimum distance between the constellation points of the network coded signals, as

$$\gamma_r(i,m) = \frac{P\min(|\ h_{i,r}\ |^2, |\ h_{m,r}\ |^2)}{N_0}. \tag{30}$$

and $\gamma_i = \frac{P_r|h_{r,i}|^2}{N_0}$ represents the SNR at the i^{th} user.

Proof: In a pairwise FDF MWRN, a network coded message is decoded both at the relay and at the users. Thus, a network coded message will be incorrectly decoded if it is incorrectly decoded at the relay and correctly decoded at the users, or, if it is correctly decoded at the relay and incorrectly decoded at the users. Since, the probability of error at the relay can be expressed as $Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_r(i,m)}\right)$ and the probability of error at the i^{th} user can be given by $Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_i}\right)$, the probability of incorrectly decoding a network coded message is given by (29). ■

Lemma 2: The probability that the ℓ^{th} (other) user incorrectly decodes the network coded message involving the i^{th} user's message and its own message or other user's messages is given as:

$$P_{FDF}(\ell,m) = \begin{cases} Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_r(\ell,m)}\right)\left(1-Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_\ell}\right)\right)+\left(1-Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_r(\ell,m)}\right)\right)Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_\ell}\right) & m=i \\ Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_r(i,m)}\right)\left(1-Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_\ell}\right)\right)+\left(1-Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_r(i,m)}\right)\right)Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_\ell}\right) & m\in[1,L], m\neq i,\ell. \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

Proof: When the ℓ^{th} user receives the network coded message involving its own message and the i^{th} user's message, the probability of error at the relay is $Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_r(i,\ell)}\right)$ and the probability of error at the ℓ^{th} user is $Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_\ell}\right)$. Similarly, when it receives the network coded message involving the i^{th} and the m^{th} ($m \neq i, \ell$) user's messages, the probability of error at the relay is $Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_r(i,m)}\right)$ and the probability of error at the ℓ^{th} user is $Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_\ell}\right)$. Using these facts, (31) can be obtained similarly as (29). ■

Using (29) and (31), the average BER at the common user and the other users can be derived using the technique proposed in [23]. The result is summarized in the following Theorem.

Theorem 3: For the proposed pairing scheme in a FDF MWRN, the average BER at the i^{th} (common) user is given by:

$$P_{i,avg} = \frac{1}{L-1} \sum_{m=1, m\neq i}^{L} P_{FDF}(i,m), \tag{32}$$

and the average BER at the ℓ^{th} (other) users is given by:

$$P_{\ell,avg} = \frac{1}{L-1} \left(\sum_{m=1, m\neq i,\ell}^{L} P_{FDF}(\ell,m) + (L-1) P_{FDF}(\ell,i) \right). \tag{33}$$

Proof: See Appendix E. ■

Using Theorem 3 and the average BER result in [23] for the pairing scheme in [1], we can compare the performance of the proposed and the existing pairing schemes. Note that the error performance of the pairing scheme in [9] would be the same as the pairing scheme in [1], as the basic pairing process is the same for both these schemes and only the pairing orders are different. The main results are summarized in Propositions 7−9.

Proposition 7: The average BER of an L-user FDF MWRN with the proposed pairing scheme is lower than the pairing scheme in [1] by a factor of $\frac{L}{2}$ for the common user and a factor of approximately $\frac{L}{4}$ for other users under the equal average channel gain scenario.

Proof: See Appendix F. ■

Proposition 8: The average BER of an L-user FDF MWRN with the proposed pairing scheme is always lower than the pairing scheme in [1] for all users under the unequal average channel gain scenario.

Proof: See Appendix F. ■

Proposition 9: The average BER of an L-user FDF MWRN with the proposed pairing scheme is always lower than the pairing scheme in [1] for all users under the variable average channel gain scenario.

Proof: See Appendix F. ■

From Propositions 7-9, it is clear that choosing the user with the best average channel gain as the common user reduces the average BER of the FDF MWRN.

VII. Results

In this section, we provide numerical results to verify the insights provided in Propositions $1-6$. We also provide simulation results to verify Propositions $7-9$. We consider an $L = 10$ user FDF MWRN where each user transmits a packet of $T = 1000$ bits. The power at the users, P and the power at the relay, P_r are assumed to be equal and normalized to unity. The SNR per bit per user is defined as $\frac{1}{N_0}$. Following [6], the average channel gain for the j^{th} user is modeled by $\sigma^2_{h_{j,r}} = (1/(d_j/d_0))^{\nu}$, where d_0 is the reference distance, d_j is the distance between the j^{th} user and the relay which is assumed to be uniformly randomly distributed between 0 and d_0, and ν is the path loss exponent, which is assumed to be 3. Such a distance based channel model takes into account large scale path loss and has been widely considered in the literature [11], [17], [25], [31]–[33]. All distances, once chosen, remain constant for unequal channel gain scenario and are randomly chosen every time frame (i.e., worst case, $T'_f = 1$) for variable channel gain scenario. Note that all the distances are the same for the equal average channel gain scenario. All results are averaged over $F = 100$ time frames.

A. Common Rate Capacity

Fig. 2 shows the common rate capacity for the proposed and the existing pairing schemes in an $L = 10$ user FDF MWRN. All the numerical results are obtained by averaging the instantaneous common rates for the pairing schemes over a large number of channel realizations. Fig. 2(a) shows that all the pairing schemes have the same average common rate in equal average channel gain scenario, which verifies Proposition 1. The common rate of the proposed pairing scheme is larger than the existing pairing schemes for the unequal average channel gain scenario in Fig. 2(b). This is because, scaling the common user's power to ensure transmission fairness decreases the ratio of the maximum and the minimum average channel gains in (20d), resulting in a larger common rate. For variable average channel gain scenario, we can see that the common rate capacity for the proposed scheme is practically the same as that of the existing pairing schemes. This verifies Propositions 2 and 3, respectively.



(a) Equal channel gain scenario (b) Unequal channel gain scenario (c) Variable channel gain scenario

Fig. 2. Common rate capacity for a $L = 10$ user FDF MWRN with different pairing schemes and different channel scenarios.



(a) Equal channel gain scenario (b) Unequal channel gain scenario (c) Variable channel gain scenario

Fig. 3. Sum rate for a $L = 10$ user FDF MWRN with different pairing schemes and different channel scenarios.

B. Sum Rate

Fig. 3 shows the sum rate for the proposed and the existing pairing schemes in an $L = 10$ user FDF MWRN for the three channel scenarios. All the numerical results are obtained by averaging the instantaneous sum rates for the pairing schemes over a large number of channel realizations. Fig. 3(a) shows that all the pairing schemes have the same average sum rate for equal average channel gain scenario, which verifies Proposition 4. Similarly, Fig. 3(b) and Fig. 3(c) show that the average sum rate for the proposed pairing scheme is larger than the existing pairing schemes, which is in line with the Propositions 5 and 6. Intuitively, this can be explained as follows. In the proposed pairing scheme, the common user with the maximum average channel gain transmits more times than the other users. Unless all the average channel gains are equal, this results in a larger sum rate compared to the existing pairing schemes.

C. Robustness of the Proposed Pairing Scheme

To illustrate robustness of the proposed pairing scheme, we consider two special cases of the variable average channel gain scenario, where (i) 10% of the users have distances below $0.1d_0$ (i.e., only a small


Common rate capacity (bits/s/Hz)
SNR (dB)
Proposed scheme, 10% users' distances below 0.1d0
Proposed scheme, 90% users' distances below 0.1d0
Scheme [1], [9], 10% users' distances below 0.1d0
Scheme [1], [9], 90% users' distances below 0.1d0
Sum rate (bits/s/Hz)
90% users' distances below 0.1d0
Proposed scheme
Scheme [1], [9]
10% users' distances below 0.1d0

(a) Common rate capacity (b) Sum rate

Fig. 4. Common rate capacity and sum rate of an $L = 10$ user FDF MWRN when 10% and 90% users have distances below $0.1d_0$.

proportion of the users are close to the relay and so, they have good channel conditions) and (ii) 90% of the users have distances below $0.1d_0$ (i.e., a large proportion of users are close to the relay and so, they have good channel conditions). Fig. 4(a) plots the average common rate capacity and Fig. 4(b) plots the average sum rate for the proposed and existing pairing schemes. We can see from Fig. 4(a) that the common rate does not change much when either 10% or 90% of users have good channel conditions. This is because the average common rate capacity depends upon the minimum average channel gain in the system. However, we can see from Fig. 4(b) that the sum rate depends on the overall channel conditions of the users. When the number of users with good channel conditions falls from 90% to 10%, the sum rate of the proposed scheme degrades to a much lesser extent, compared to the existing pairing schemes. This is because the average sum rate of the proposed pairing scheme depends to a greater extent on the common user's average channel gain compared to the other users' average channel gain (as evident from (24c)). However, for the existing pairing schemes, the sum rate depends on all the channel gains equally (as evident from (25) and (26)). Thus, the sum rate for the existing pairing schemes degrades to a greater extent, compared to the proposed pairing scheme. This illustrates the robustness of the proposed pairing scheme.

D. Average BER

Figures 5(a), 5(b) and 6(a) plot the average BER of the proposed and the existing pairing schemes in an $L = 10$ user FDF MWRN for equal channel gain scenario (Fig. 5(a)), unequal channel gain scenario (Fig. 5(b)) and variable channel gain scenario (Fig. 6(a)). We can see from all the figures that the simulation



(a) Equal channel gain scenario

(b) Unequal channel gain scenario

Fig. 5. Average BER for equal and unequal average channel gains in an $L = 10$ user FDF MWRN with different pairing schemes.

results match perfectly with the analytical results for mid to high SNRs (generally, SNR > 5 dB). This verifies the accuracy of Theorem 3. Note that the existing pairing schemes in [1] and [9] have the same average BER. So, only the results for pairing scheme in [1] have been shown in the above figures. Figures 5(a), 5(b) and 6(a) show that the proposed pairing scheme outperforms the existing pairing schemes, in terms of average BER, which verifies Propositions 7-9. In addition, Fig. 5(a) shows that the average BER at the common user and other users are 5 times and nearly 2.5 times less than that of the existing pairing schemes. This verifies Proposition 7.

Fig. 6(b) plots the average BER of the proposed and the existing pairing schemes for the special cases of the variable average channel gain scenario when (i) 10% of the users have distances below $0.1d_0$ and (ii) 90% of the users have distances below $0.1d_0$. The figure shows that the average BER for the existing pairing schemes improves by a lesser extent compared to that of the proposed scheme with the improvement in the users' channel conditions. For the proposed pairing scheme, when the number of users with good channel conditions increases from 10% to 90%, the average BER at other users improve significantly and approaches the average BER at the common user. This is because the average BER at the ℓ^{th} user depends not only on its own channel conditions, but also the channel conditions of the common (i^{th}) user and the m^{th} user (see (33)). This improvement in the overall channel conditions results in improvement in the average BER, which illustrates the superiority of the proposed pairing scheme.



(a) Variable channel gain scenario



(b) Variable channel gain scenario where 10% and 90% users, respectively, have distances below $0.1d_0$.

Fig. 6. Average BER for variable average channel gains in an $L = 10$ user FDF MWRN with different pairing schemes.

VIII. Conclusions

In this paper, we have proposed a novel user pairing scheme in a FDF MWRN. We have derived the upper bound on the average common rate capacity and the average sum rate and the asymptotic average BER for the proposed pairing scheme. We have compared the results with existing pairing schemes under different channel scenarios. Our analysis shows that the proposed pairing scheme improves the aforementioned performance metrics compared to that of the existing pairing schemes for different channel conditions. The main analytical results are summarized in Theorems 1-3 and Propositions 1-9. The numerical results and simulations corroborate the analytical results and show that the proposed pairing scheme outperforms the existing pairing schemes.

Appendix A

Proof of Theorem 1

In the proposed pairing scheme, the i^{th} and the ℓ^{th} user transmit simultaneously in the $(\ell-1)^{th}$ time slot in the multiple access phase. Also, in the broadcast phase, in the $(\ell-1)^{th}$ time slot, the relay broadcasts the decoded network coded message to all the users. For the *multiple access phase* the optimum values of α and β_j in (13) and (12), respectively, are obtained by setting $\frac{dn}{d\alpha} = 0$ and $\frac{dn'}{d\beta_j} = 0$, where n and n' are given in (7) and (9), respectively. From this, we obtain $\alpha = \frac{P|h_{i,r}|^2+P|h_{\ell,r}|^2}{P|h_{i,r}|^2+P|h_{\ell,r}|^2+N_0}$ and $\beta_j = \frac{P_r|h_{j,r}|^2}{P_r|h_{j,r}|^2+N_0}$. Substituting these values in (13) and (12), (18) and (19) can be derived following the steps in [28] and [9], which are summarized as follows. First, we assume that there exists a rate $\bar{R} < R_{M,\ell-1}$ for which $\Pr(n \notin \mathcal{V})$ (see

(7)) is upper bounded by $e^{-N(E_p(\mu))}$, where E_p is the Poltyrev exponent, $\mu = 2^{2(R_{M,\ell-1}-\bar{R})} - O_N(1)$ [28] is the volume to noise ratio of the lattice Λ with respect to the noise n, $O_N(1)$ indicates that the difference between μ and $2^{2(R_{M,\ell-1}-\bar{R})}$ is a first degree function of N and Λ is Poltyrev-good [28]. Then calculating μ and comparing with $2^{2(R_{M,\ell-1}-\bar{R})} - O_N(1)$ gives (18) in Theorem 1. For the *broadcast phase*, (19) in Theorem 1 can be obtained from the point to point channel capacity of the users. The details are omitted here for the sake of brevity. This completes the proof.

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF PROPOSITIONS 1−3

Proof of Proposition 1: For the equal average channel gain scenario, $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} = \sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}} = \sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}} = \sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}$. Thus, the average common rate capacity expressed by (21), (22) and (20d) becomes the same for all the three pairing schemes. This proves Proposition 1.

Proof of Proposition 2: For unequal average channel gain scenario, as explained in Section III, the transmit power of the i^{th} user needs to be scaled by $(L-1)$ to ensure transmission fairness. As a result, $\mid h_{i,r} \mid^2$ can be replaced by $\frac{|h_{i,r}|^2}{L-1}$ in (13). In addition, for a fair comparison with the existing pairing schemes, the transmit power P in the proposed scheme, needs to be multiplied by a factor $(2L-2)$. This is because in the proposed pairing scheme, the common user transmits $(L-1)$ times with power $\frac{P}{L-1}$ and the other $(L-1)$ users transmit once with power P. Hence, the average power per user becomes P. However, for the existing pairing schemes, the average power per user is $\frac{2L-2}{L}P$. Overall, (20d) can be modified by scaling $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}$ with $L-1$ and replacing P with $(2L-2)P$. Thus, the average common rate in (20d) is

$$E[R_c] \leq \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \log \left(\min \left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{(L-1)\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}} + \frac{(2L-2)P\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{(L-1)N_0}, \frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{(L-1)\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}} + \frac{(2L-2)P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{N_0} \right) \right). \tag{34}$$

We consider two cases:

- *case 1*: $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} > (L-1)\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}$. In this case, the second quantity in the right hand side of (34) will be the minimum. Then, comparing (34) and (21) shows that $\frac{(2L-2)P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{N_0} > \frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{N_0}$. Thus, the average common rate for scheme [1] will be smaller than that for the proposed pairing scheme, when $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} < (L-1)\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}$. Similarly, it can be shown that for the pairing scheme in [9], the average common rate is smaller than that for the proposed scheme for $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} < (L-1)\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}$.

- *case 2*: $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} < (L-1)\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}$. In this case, the first quantity in the right hand side of (34) will be the minimum. Then comparing (34) and (21) shows that the common rate of scheme [1] will be smaller than that of the proposed pairing scheme, when $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} > (L-1)\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}$. Similarly, it can be shown that for the pairing scheme in [9], the average common rate is smaller than that of the proposed scheme for $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} > (L-1)\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}$.

Combining the result from the two cases, the proposed pairing scheme will have larger average common rate capacity compared to the two other pairing schemes, which proves Proposition 2.

Proof of Proposition 3: For the variable channel gain scenario, $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}$ in (20d) is the largest average channel gain in the system. Thus, from (20d), it can be shown that $\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}} > \frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}$ and the second quantity in the right hand side of the inequality in (20d) is the minimum. Then comparing (20d) and (21) would show that $\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}} \leq \frac{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}$. It means that the largest possible ratio of average channel gains in an L-user MWRN is the ratio of the highest average channel gain and the lowest average channel gain. Similarly, from (20d) and (22), it can be shown that $\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}} \leq \frac{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}$ and $\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}} \leq \frac{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}$. However, the impact of either of these ratios on the overall average common rate is small compared to that of the term $\frac{P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{N_0}$ in (20d), (21) and (22). Thus, the common rate capacity for the proposed scheme will be practially the same as that of the existing pairing schemes in [1] and [9], which proves Proposition 3.

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF THEOREM 2

The achievable rate at the $(\ell-1)^{th}$ time slot can be obtained from (17). Since, $\frac{|h_{i,r}|^2}{|h_{i,r}|^2+|h_{\ell,r}|^2} < 1$, the achievable rate at the $(\ell-1)^{th}$ time slot will be determined by the achievable rate at the corresponding time slot in the multiple access phase. Then, obtaining the achievable rate in all the time slots and adding them results into (23). The detailed steps are omitted here for the sake of brevity.

APPENDIX D
PROOF OF PROPOSITIONS 4−6

Proof of Proposition 4: For the equal average channel gain scenario, $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} = \sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}} = \sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}} = \sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}$. Thus, the sum rates expressed by (24c), (25) and (26) become the same for all the three pairing schemes, which proves Proposition 4.

Proof of Proposition 5: For the unequal average channel gain scenario, if the common user is made to transmit at all the time slots with scaled power, the sum rate can be obtained from (24c) with $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}$ scaled

by $L-1$ and P replaced with $(2L-2)P$. In this case, the average sum rate in (24c) becomes

$$E[R_s] = \frac{1}{2(L-1)} \sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{L} \left(\log \left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{(L-1)\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}} + \frac{(2L-2)P\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{(L-1)N_0} \right) + \log \left(\frac{1}{1+\frac{\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}}}{(L-1)\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}} + \frac{(2L-2)P\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}}{N_0} \right) \right). \quad (35)$$

Comparing (35) and (25) shows that $2\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} > \sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}$ and $(2L-2)\sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}} > \sigma^2_{h_{\ell,r}}$. Thus, both the terms in (25) are smaller than the corresponding terms in (35). In a similar manner, it can be shown that the average sum rate of the proposed scheme is larger than that of the scheme in [9]. This completes the proof for Proposition 5.

Proof of Proposition 6: For the variable average channel gain scenario, we have $\sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} \geq \sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}$. Hence, it is clear that $\sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{L} \sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} > \sum_{\ell=2}^{L} \sigma^2_{h_{\ell-1,r}}$. Similarly, it can be shown that $\sum_{\ell=1,\ell\neq i}^{L} \sigma^2_{h_{i,r}} > \sum_{\ell=2}^{L} \sigma^2_{h_{L-\ell+2,r}}$. Thus the proposed pairing scheme will have a larger average sum rate (given by (24c)), compared to that of the pairing schemes in [1] and [9] (given by (25) and (26), respectively). This proves Proposition 6.

APPENDIX E
PROOF OF THEOREM 3

The proof follows the general steps outlined in [23], which are applicable to any user pairing scheme. However, for the proposed pairing scheme, we need to modify these steps to take into account different error probabilities at the common user and the other users. The modified steps can be summarized as follows:

1) Determine the probabilities that the i^{th} user and the ℓ^{th} user incorrectly decode a network coded message, respectively.
2) Define the possible error cases for the $k^{th}(k \in [1, L-1])$ error event at the i^{th} and the ℓ^{th}user, where the k^{th} error event means that exactly k number of users' messages are incorrectly decoded.
3) Express the probabilities of the aforementioned error cases in terms of the probabilities of incorrectly decoding a network coded message.
4) Combine the probabilities of different error cases to determine the probability of the k^{th} error event at the i^{th} and the ℓ^{th} user.
5) Obtain the expected probability of all the error events to determine the exact average BER expression.

6) Apply the high SNR approximation to obtain approximate but accurate average BER expressions.

Now, we illustrate these steps in detail:

Step-1: The probabilities of incorrectly decoding a network coded message at the i^{th} and the ℓ^{th} user are obtained in (29) and (31), respectively.

Step-2: In the proposed pairing scheme, k error events can occur in two cases

- A_k: If the decoding user incorrectly extracts exactly k users' messages except the i^{th} user's message. That is, the decoding user (j^{th} user, where $j \in [1, L]$) incorrectly decodes k network coded messages $V_{i,m_1}, V_{i,m_2}, ..., V_{i,m_k}$ and correctly decodes the remaining $L-1-k$ network coded messages, where $m_1, m_2, ..., m_k \in [1, L], m_1 \neq m_2 \neq ... \neq m_k \neq j$.
- B_k: If the decoding user incorrectly decodes exactly k users' messages including the i^{th} user's message. This happens when the decoding user (ℓ^{th} user, where $\ell \in [1, L], \ell \neq i$) incorrectly decodes $V_{i,\ell}$ and correctly decodes $k-1$ other network coded messages, $V_{i,m_1}, V_{i,m_2}, ..., V_{i,m_{k-1}}$ and incorrectly decodes the remaining $L-1-k$ messages, where $m_1, m_2, ..., m_{k-1} \in [1, L], m_1 \neq m_2 \neq ... \neq m_{k-1} \neq i, \ell$.

Note that, the error case A_k is applicable both for the common user and the other users. However, case B_k is applicable only for users except the common user.

Step-3: The probabilities of the aforementioned error cases for the i^{th} and the ℓ^{th} users can be expressed as

$$P_{i,A_k} = \sum_{m_a=1, m_a \neq i}^{L} \prod_{a=1}^{k} P_{FDF}(i, m_a) \prod_{m_b=1, m_b \neq m_a, i}^{L} \{1 - P_{FDF}(i, m_b)\}. \tag{36}$$

$$P_{\ell,A_k} = \sum_{m_a=1, m_a \neq i, \ell}^{L} \prod_{a=1}^{k} P_{FDF}(\ell, m_a) \prod_{m_b=1, m_b \neq \ell, m_a}^{L} \{1 - P_{FDF}(\ell, m_b)\}. \tag{37}$$

$$P_{\ell,B_k} = \begin{cases} P_{FDF}(\ell, i) \sum_{m_a=1, m_a \neq i, \ell}^{L} \prod_{a=1}^{k-1} \{1 - P_{FDF}(\ell, m_a)\} \prod_{m_b=1, m_b \neq i, \ell, m_a}^{L} P_{FDF}(\ell, m_b) & 1 < k < L-1 \\ P_{FDF}(\ell, i) \prod_{m_b=1, m_b \neq i, \ell}^{L} \{1 - P_{FDF}(\ell, m_b)\} & k = 1 \\ P_{FDF}(\ell, i) \sum_{m_a=1, m_a \neq i, \ell}^{L} \prod_{a=1}^{L-1} \{1 - P_{FDF}(\ell, m_a)\} & k = L-1. \end{cases} \tag{38}$$

Step-4: The probability of k error events for the i^{th} and the ℓ^{th} user can be expressed as

$$P(i,k) = P_{i,A_k}, \tag{39a}$$

$$P(\ell,k) = P_{\ell,A_k} + P_{\ell,B_k}. \tag{39b}$$

Step-5: Since, each user decodes $L-1$ other users' messages in an L-user MWRN, there are $L-1$ possible error events. Thus, averaging over all the possible error events, the average BER at the i^{th} and the ℓ^{th} user can be obtained as:

$$P_{i,avg} = \frac{1}{L-1}\sum_{k=1}^{L-1} kP_{i,A_k} \tag{40a}$$

$$P_{j,avg} = \frac{1}{L-1}\sum_{k=1}^{L-1} k(P_{\ell,A_k} + P_{\ell,B_k}) \tag{40b}$$

Step-6: At high SNR, the higher order error terms in (39) can be neglected. Thus, $P_{i,A_k} \approx 0$ and $P_{\ell,A_k} \approx 0$ for $k > 1$ (see (36) and (37)). Similarly, $P_{\ell,B_k} \approx 0$ for $k < L-1$ (see (38)). Thus, at high SNR, (40) can be approximated as

$$P_{i,avg} = \frac{1}{L-1}P_{i,A_1}, \tag{41a}$$

$$P_{\ell,avg} = \frac{1}{L-1}\left(P_{\ell,A_1} + (L-1)P_{\ell,B_{L-1}}\right). \tag{41b}$$

In addition, at high SNR, we can approximate the terms $\{1 - P_{FDF}(i,m_b)\}$, $\{1 - P_{FDF}(\ell,m_b)\}$ and $\{1 - P_{FDF}(\ell,m_a)\}$ in (36), (37) and (38) to be 1. Thus, substituting (36), (37) and (38) in (41), the average BER at the i^{th} and the ℓ^{th} user at high SNR can be expressed as

$$P_{i,avg} = \frac{1}{L-1}\sum_{m_1=1,m_1\neq i}^{L} P_{FDF}(i,m_1), \tag{42a}$$

$$P_{\ell,avg} = \frac{1}{L-1}\left(\sum_{m_1=1,m_1\neq i,\ell}^{L} P_{FDF}(\ell,m_1) + (L-1)P_{FDF}(\ell,i)\right). \tag{42b}$$

Finally, replacing m_1 with m in the above equation completes the proof.

APPENDIX F
PROOF OF PROPOSITIONS 7−9

Proof of Proposition 7: For the equal average channel gain scenario, the error probabilities $P_{FDF}(j,1) = P_{FDF}(j,2) = ... = P_{FDF}(j,L-1) = P_{FDF}$ for all $j \in [1,L]$. Thus, the average BER expressions in (32)

and (33) for the proposed pairing scheme can be simplified as:

$$P_{i,avg} = P_{FDF}, \tag{43a}$$

$$P_{\ell,avg} = \left(\frac{2L-3}{L-1}\right) P_{FDF}. \tag{43b}$$

The average BER for the scheme in [1] can be given by [23]:

$$P_{avg} = \frac{L}{2} P_{FDF}. \tag{44}$$

Comparing (43) and (44), we arrive at Proposition 7.

Proof of Proposition 8: For the unequal average channel gain scenario, the average BER expressions for the proposed pairing scheme is given by (32) and (33), with $\gamma_r(i,m) = \frac{(2L-2)P\min\left(\frac{|h_{i,r}|^2}{L-1}, |h_{m,r}|^2\right)}{N_0}$ and $\gamma_i = \frac{(2L-2)P_r|h_{i,r}|^2}{N_0}$. For the scheme in [1], the average BER at the $j^{th}(j \in [1,L])$ user can be written as

$$P_{j,avg} = \frac{1}{L-1}\sum_{m=1}^{L-1} m P_{FDF}(j,m), \tag{45}$$

where

$$P_{FDF}(j,m) = Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_r(m)}\right)\left(1 - Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_j}\right)\right) + \left(1 - Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_r(m)}\right)\right) Q\left(\sqrt{2\gamma_j}\right), \tag{46}$$

and $\gamma_r(m) = \frac{P\min(|h_{m,r}|^2, |h_{m+1,r}|^2)}{N_0}$ and $\gamma_j = \frac{P_r|h_{j,r}|^2}{N_0}$. Now we consider two cases:

- *case 1*: $E[\frac{|h_{i,r}|^2}{L-1}] > E[|\ h_{m,r}\ |^2]$. In this case,

$$\begin{aligned}
&E\left[\min\left(\frac{(2L-2)P\mid h_{i,r}\mid^2}{(L-1)N_0}, \frac{(2L-2)P\mid h_{m,r}\mid^2}{N_0}\right)\right] \\
&\leq \min\left(E\left[\frac{(2L-2)P\mid h_{i,r}\mid^2}{(L-1)N_0}\right], E\left[\frac{(2L-2)P\mid h_{m,r}\mid^2}{N_0}\right]\right) = E\left[\frac{(2L-2)P\mid h_{m,r}\mid^2}{N_0}\right] \\
&\geq \min\left(E\left[\frac{P\mid h_{m,r}\mid^2}{N_0}\right], E\left[\frac{P\mid h_{m+1,r}\mid^2}{N_0}\right]\right) \\
&\geq E\left[\min\left(\frac{P\mid h_{m,r}\mid^2}{N_0}, \frac{P\mid h_{m+1,r}\mid^2}{N_0}\right)\right].
\end{aligned} \tag{47}$$

  Thus, $E[\gamma_r(i,m)] \geq E[\gamma_r(m)]$.

- *case 2*: $E[\frac{|h_{i,r}|^2}{L-1}] < E[|\ h_{m,r}\ |^2]$. In this case, $E\left[\min\left(\frac{(2L-2)P|h_{i,r}|^2}{(L-1)N_0}, \frac{(2L-2)P|h_{m,r}|^2}{N_0}\right)\right] \leq E[\frac{(2L-2)P|h_{i,r}|^2}{(L-1)N_0}]$ and since, $|\ h_{i,r}\ |^2 > |\ h_{m,r}\ |^2, |\ h_{m+1,r}\ |^2$, $E\left[\min\left(\frac{|h_{m,r}|^2}{N_0}, \frac{|h_{m+1,r}|^2}{N_0}\right)\right] \leq E\left[\frac{(2L-2)P|h_{i,r}|^2}{(L-1)N_0}\right]$. Thus, $E[\gamma_r(i,m)] \geq E[\gamma_r(m)]$.

From the above cases, the probability $P_{FDF}(i,m)$ and $P_{FDF}(\ell,m)$ for the proposed scheme would be

larger than $P_{FDF}(j,m)$ for scheme [1]. Thus, comparing (32), (33) and (45) shows that the average BER for the proposed scheme would be smaller than that for scheme [1]. This proves Proposition 8.

Proof of Proposition 9: For the variable average channel gain scenario, the average BER expression for the proposed pairing scheme is given by (32) and (33). The average BER for the pairing scheme in [1] is the same as in (45). Now, comparing $P_{FDF}(i,m)$ (from (29)), $P_{FDF}(\ell,m)$ (from (31)) and $P_{FDF}(j,m)$ (from (46)) shows that the only terms which are different in all these probabilities are $\gamma_r(i,m)$ and $\gamma_r(m)$. Note that, if $E[|\ h_{i,r}\ |^2] > E[|\ h_{m+1,r}\ |^2]$, then $E[\min(|\ h_{i,r}\ |^2, |\ h_{m,r}\ |^2)] \geq E[\min(|\ h_{m+1,r}\ |^2, |\ h_{m,r}\ |^2)]$. Thus, $E[\gamma_r(i,m)] \geq E[\gamma_r(m)]$ and in effect, from (29), (31) and (46), the error probability for the new pairing scheme would be less than that for scheme [1]. As a result, the average BER for the proposed scheme (in (32) and (33)) is less than that of scheme [1] (in (45)) for both $j = i$ and $j = \ell$, which proves Proposition 9.

REFERENCES

[1] L. Ong, S. J. Johnson, and C. M. Kellett, "An optimal coding strategy for the binary multi-way relay channel," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 14, no. 4, pp. 330–332, Apr. 2010.

[2] L. Ong, C. M. Kellett, and S. J. Johnson, "On the equal-rate capacity of the AWGN multiway relay channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 58, no. 9, pp. 5761–5769, Sep. 2012.

[3] D. Gündüz, A. Yener, A. Goldsmith, and H. V. Poor, "The multi-way relay channel," in *Proc. IEEE ISIT*, Jul. 2009, pp. 339–343.

[4] ——, "The multi-way relay channel," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 51–63, Jan. 2013.

[5] G. Amarasuriya, C. Tellambura, and M. Ardakani, "Performance analysis of pairwise amplify-and-forward multi-way relay networks," *IEEE Wireless Commun. Lett.*, vol. 1, no. 5, pp. 524–527, Oct. 2012.

[6] ——, "Multi-way MIMO amplify-and-forward relay networks with zero-forcing transmission," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 61, no. 12, pp. 4847–4863, Dec. 2013.

[7] G. Wang, W. Xiang, and J. Yuan, "Outage performance for compute-and-forward in generalized multi-way relay channels," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 16, no. 12, pp. 2099–2102, Dec. 2012.

[8] Y. Ma, T. Huang, J. Li, J. Yuan, Z. Lin, and B. Vucetic, "Novel nested convolutional lattice codes for multi-way relaying systems over fading channels," in *Proc. IEEE WCNC*, Apr. 2013, pp. 2671–2676.

[9] M. Noori and M. Ardakani, "Optimal user pairing for asymmetric multi-way relay channels with pairwise relaying," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 16, no. 11, pp. 1852–1855, Nov. 2012.

[10] A. Yang, Z. Fei, C. Xing, M. Xiao, J. Yuan, and J. Kuang, "Design of binary network codes for multiuser multiway relay networks," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 62, no. 8, pp. 3786–3799, Oct. 2013.

[11] S. Zhang, S. C. Liew, and P. P. Lam, "Hot topic: physical-layer network coding," in *Proc. ACM MOBICOM*, Sep. 2006, pp. 358–365.

[12] S. Katti, S. Gollakota, and D. Katabi, "Embracing wireless interference: Analog network coding," in *Proc. ACM SIGCOMM*, Aug. 2007, pp. 397–408.

[13] J. N. Laneman, D. N. C. Tse, and G. W. Wornell, "Cooperative diversity in wireless networks: Efficient protocols and outage behavior," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 12, pp. 3062–3080, Dec. 2004.

[14] P. Popovski and H. Yomo, "Physical network coding in two-way wireless relay channels," in *Proc. IEEE ICC*, Jun. 2007, pp. 707–712.

[15] T. Cui, T. Ho, and J. Kliewer, "Memoryless relay strategies for two-way relay channels," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 3132–3143, Oct. 2009.

[16] M. Chen and A. Yener, "Multiuser two-way relaying: detection and interference management strategies," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 8, no. 8, pp. 4296–4305, Aug. 2009.

[17] ——, "Power allocation for F/TDMA multiuser two-way relay networks," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 546–551, Feb. 2010.

[18] W. Xu, X. Dong, and W.-S. Lu, "Joint precoding optimization for multiuser multi-antenna relaying downlinks using quadratic programming," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 59, no. 5, pp. 1228–1235, May 2011.

[19] J. Zhang, F. Roemer, M. Haardt, A. Khabbazibasmenj, and S. Vorobyov, "Sum rate maximization for multi-pair two-way relaying with single-antenna amplify and forward relays," in *Proc. ICASSP*, Mar. 2012, pp. 2477–2480.

[20] H. Ngo and E. Larsson, "Large-scale multipair two-way relay networks with distributed AF beamforming," *IEEE Commun. Lett.*, vol. 17, no. 12, pp. 2288–2291, Dec. 2013.

[21] N. Yang, P. Yeoh, M. Elkashlan, I. Collings, and Z. Chen, "Two-way relaying with multi-antenna sources: Beamforming and antenna selection," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 3996–4008, Nov. 2012.

[22] B. Nazer and M. Gastpar, "Compute-and-forward: Harnessing interference through structured codes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 10, pp. 6463–6486, Oct. 2011.

[23] S. N. Islam, P. Sadeghi, and S. Durrani, "Error performance analysis of DF and AF multi-way relay networks with BPSK modulation," *IET Commun.*, vol. 7, no. 15, pp. 1605–1616, Oct. 2013.

[24] M. Ju and I.-M. Kim, "Error performance analysis of BPSK modulation in physical layer network coded bidirectional relay networks," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 58, no. 10, pp. 2770–2775, Oct. 2010.

[25] R. H. Y. Louie, Y. Li, and B. Vucetic, "Practical physical layer network coding for two-way relay channels: performance analysis and comparison," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 764–777, Feb. 2010.

[26] Z. Zhao, Z. Ding, M. Peng, W. Wang, and K. K. Leung, "A special case of multi-way relay channel: When beamforming is not applicable," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 2046–2051, Jul. 2011.

[27] U. Erez and R. Zamir, "Achieving 1/2 log (1+snr) on the awgn channel with lattice encoding and decoding," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 50, no. 10, pp. 2293–2314, Oct. 2004.

[28] W. Nam, S.-Y. Chung, and Y. H. Lee, "Nested lattice codes for gaussian relay networks with interference," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 57, no. 12, pp. 7733–7745, Dec. 2011.

[29] Y. Song and N. Devroye, "Lattice codes for the gaussian relay channel: Decode-and-forward and compress-and-forward," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 59, no. 8, pp. 4927–4948, Aug. 2013.

[30] Z. Ding and K. K. Leung, "Impact of imperfect channel state information on bi-directional communications with relay selection," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 59, no. 11, pp. 5657–5662, Nov. 2011.

[31] F. S. Tabataba, P. Sadeghi, and M. R. Pakravan, "Outage probability and power allocation of amplify and forward relaying with channel estimation errors," *IEEE Trans. Wireless Commun.*, vol. 10, no. 1, pp. 124–134, Jan. 2011.

[32] F. Tabataba, P. Sadeghi, C. Hucher, and M. Pakravan, "Impact of channel estimation errors and power allocation on analog network coding and routing in two-way relaying," *IEEE Trans. Veh. Technol.*, vol. 61, no. 7, pp. 3223–3239, Sep. 2012.

[33] G. Kramer, M. Gastpar, and P. Gupta, "Cooperative strategies and capacity theorems for relay networks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 51, no. 9, pp. 3037–3063, Sep. 2005.